



Patent Office Mail Receipt Room:

RECEIVED
JUN 02 2003
TC 1700

This response is due by May 26th, 2003 which is Memorial Day.

It was mailed on May 23rd and I trust that arrival by May 27th is acceptable.

I am an individual now pursuing this invention. I was granted old age (78!) priority status.

The delay was due to the tooling up and production of realistic prototypes.

Accompanying this response is PTO Form 2028 with credit card payment for the late fee of \$985.00.

A previous letter with samples was sent to the examiner on May 15th and might have been held up pending this payment.

I trust that you will now forward the previous letter and the attached response to the examiner.

If there are any difficulties please contact me. Please phone or fax me at 973-276-3051 or Email me at MPSeckel@AOL.com.

Many thanks.

Peter H. Seckel.

MAY 28 2003
PATENT & TRADEMARKS

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231.

Applicant: Peter H. Seckel, 459 Passaic Avenue # 315, West Caldwell, NJ 07006-7464
Ph & Fax-973-276-3051. E-mail MPSeckel@AOL.com

Attention: Examiner: Loney, Donald J.

US Serial No: 09/606,555

Filed: 06/29/00

For: Domed Packing Material

Art Unit: 1772

05/29/2003 EFLORES 00000049 09606555

01 FC:2255

985.00 OP

Date of this - May 23, 2003.

1772
\$
#14
6/20/03
PC

RECEIVED
JUN 02 2003
TC 1700

This response is due by May 26th, 2003 which is Memorial Day. I trust that mailing today and arrival by May 27th is acceptable. I am an individual now pursuing this invention. I was granted old age (78!) priority status.

The delay is due to the tooling up and production of realistic prototypes which prove that the process and product are feasible. Samples and a covering letter were sent on May 15th.

Accompanying this response is PTO Form 2028 - Credit Card Payment for the late fee of \$985.00. Please advise if other fees are due.

I trust that this payment will allow the samples and letter transmitted on May 15th to be forwarded to the examiner, along with this response.

Claims 1,5 and 6 were disallowed as anticipated by Fabre - 3,895,456:

May I respectfully point out that Fabre produces each sheet separately. They are identical. They can be snapped together tightly (they use the word nesting in a different sense) because they have an indent. The result is an intriguing toy assembly. Fabre's sheets are rigid and must be folded, whereas our film is flexible in all directions.

Our product also has the reverse intent. Our intention is to dome an assembly of multiple sheets wherein the domes are of progressively smaller or larger size, depending on which way one looks at it, so that they nest initially but can be easily disarranged to form a bulky flexible packaging material. Fabre's Figures 5 and 6 look deceptively like our invention but are totally different as described above. I respectfully suggest that prior knowledge of Fabre would not lead to my concept.

Claims 1,5 and 29 were disallowed as anticipated by Francis - 4,518,643.

Here again the product is formed one film at a time in a pattern which allows two films to slide or slip alongside each other, or, in reverse, to lock together. Figure 6 is a cross section of a single domed film. The entire purpose is to control the coefficient of friction. Although figures 4 and 6 look impressively